

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as unpatentable over Kamada (6,108,683).

The examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to Claim 1, the examiner points to Figure 3 for the overall user-level scheduler and the associated user processes. However, in accordance with embodiments of applicant's invention as shown in applicant's Figure 3, a process scheduler A (101) is associated with a group of user processes (user process 120), and a separate and distinct process scheduler B (102) is associated with a second and distinct group of user processes (121 and 122). The arrangement is not a nested arrangement in which a first user level process calls a second user level process and the second user level process calls user processes. Rather, process scheduler A selects one of the user processes from the first group (in this case only one user process 120) and the process scheduler B selects one of the user processes B (121 or 122). Process schedule A cannot select process scheduler B as done in Kamada. In order to better differentiate applicant's invention from the Kamada teaching, applicant has amended Claim 1 in order to recite plural independent process schedulers respectfully associated with separate plural user process groups. Moreover, applicant inserted the limitations of dependent Claims 2, 3 and 4 into independent claim 1 and has further included a recitation that the administrator includes an administrative table. Applicant has further recited that the selector sequentially increments an index of the administrative table associated with the starting address to select the executable user processes. These additional limitations are not disclosed in Kamada and are patentable there over.

Applicant's independent Claim 6 has likewise been amended to recite plural independent process schedulers respectfully associated with separate user process groups. Claim 6 is likewise deemed to be patentable over Kamada in reciting a structurally different arrangement then shown in Kamada's Figure 3.

It is submitted that the Kamada reference must be withdrawn as a Section 102 rejection. In order for a reference to be applied as an anticipatory reference under 35 U.S.C.

§ 102, the reference must disclose each and every limitation of the claim. This is certainly not the case here and thus, the Section 102 rejection cannot stand.

It is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 5-26-04

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257